UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,249	01/25/2002	Senthil Prabakaran	12849-002001	2769

21005   7590   07/21/2004

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER
LE, DEBBIE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/057,249	PRABAKARAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DEBBIE M LE	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 January 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _5-6_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the parameters" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the node" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the independent node" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-11, 14,17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Hind et al (USP 6,585,778 B1).

As per claim 1, Hind discloses a method comprising:

providing a network (fig. 1, communication channel # 32), the network having a

first system (fig. 1, # 10, workstation);

generating a request of a policy from the first system (as a user requested

information for a specific book title, data policy col. 11, lines 9-10) to a second system

(data source, or server, col. 1, lines 15-21, col. 7, lines 6-8);

retrieving the policy for the first system in the second system (fig. 5-6, col. 13,

lines 1-56); and

providing the policy to the first system (data policy which restricts the values that

will be displayed to the requesting user, col. 11, lines 16-17).

As per claim 2, Hind teaches a third system for determining the policy the first

system should receive (publishing company, col. 3, lines 37-48, col. 4, lines 38-42, 50-

59, col. 11, lines 18-35).

As per claim 3, Hind teaches the second system designates the parameters of the policy (col. 9, lines 52-53).

As per claim 4, Hind teaches a third system for receiving the policy from the second system (col. 9, lines 20-50).

As per claim 5, Hind teaches wherein the first system is a policy enabled node (figs 1-2, col. 8, lines 60-67).

As per claim 6, Hind teaches wherein the policy enabled node is enabled by a node proxy (col. 3, lines 40-45).

As per claim 7, Hind teaches wherein the policy parameters are unique to the request (col. 9, lines 50-67).

As per claim 8, Hind teaches wherein the node is a computer (fig. 2, remote server, col. 6, lines 60-67).

As per claim 9, Hind teaches wherein the independent node is a software application (application programming code, or server application, col. 7, lines 20-50).

As per claim 10, Hind teaches wherein a provider facilitates transfer of the policy from a data source (distributed network computing, publishing company, col. 7, line 20, col. 9, lines 21-22).

Claims 11 and 14 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 argument.

As per claims 17-19, Hind teaches a policy parameter wherein the policy parameter calls for each object (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 63-65, col. 9, lines 36-64).

As per claims 20-22, Hind teaches wherein the first system uses Extensible

Markup Language (XML), Directory Services Markup Language (DSML), or Simple

Object Access Protocol (SOAP) (col. 4, lines 36-37).

As per claim 23, Hind discloses a method for implementing policies for the

administration of nodes connected to a network having at least, a single node or

plurality of nodes to be policy enabled (fig. 2), one or more policy managers that

determine the specific policy the node(s) should receive (publishing company, col. 3,

lines 37-48, col. 4, lines 38-42, 50-59, col. 11, lines 18-35), and one or more data

sources for the storage of policies data source, or server, col. 1, lines 15-21, col. 7, lines

6-8), said method comprising the steps of:

providing for the request of a policy from the node or node proxy to the policy

manager as a user requested information for a specific book title, data policy col. 11,

lines 9-10), with the specific policy parameters for the particular node making the

request (col. 3, lines 5-12);

providing for the determination of the particular provider needed to facilitate

transfer of the requested policy from the data source fig. 5-6, col. 13, lines 1-56);

providing for the transfer of a resultant list of policies from the particular data

source based on the policy parameters (col. 11, lines 45-62);

providing for the modification of the list of policies in accordance with a dynamic

set of policy rules (flexible, dynamically, col. 8, lines 59-67);

providing for the retrieval of the policy settings associated with the policies in the

modified list (col. 14, lines 10-26);

providing for the transfer of the policy attributes to the particular node making the

request (col. 10, lines 32-52); and

providing for the implementation of the policy attributes on the particular node

making the request (data policy which restricts the values that will be displayed to the

requesting user, col. 11, lines 16-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 12-13, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hind et al (USP 6,585,778 B1) in view of Helgeson et al (USP 6, 643,652).

As per claims 12-13 and 5-16, Hind teaches intermediaries commonly apply various types translations and/or transformations based upon target text (col. 7, lines 25-45). Hind does not explicitly teach having the same and a different operating system for the first system and the second system. However, Helgeson teaches the first and the second have the same and/or different operating systems (col. 1, lines 53-67, col. 11, lines 27-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited of references to implement the first and second with the same or different operating systems because it would provide user efficient to import/export/exchange data among different operating systems based upon a user's target text.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M LE whose telephone number is 703-308-6409. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN BREENE can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEBBIE M LE
Examiner
Art Unit 2177

Debbie Le.

June 25, 2004.

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER